DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 198 HE 000 183

By- Kerr, Clark

The Urban-Grant University: A Model for the Future.

City Univ. of New York, N.Y.

Pub Date 68

Note- 15p.; Lecture given to Centennial Meeting of The City College Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, New York, October 18, 1967

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.85

Descriptors- City Improvement, *City Problems, College High School Cooperation, *Educational Equality, *Educational Innovation, *Higher Education, Urban Education, Urban Schools, *Urban Universities

Identifiers- *Urban Grant University

Many US colleges and universities, including some in urban settings, are apparently less concerned with urban problems today than they were a third of a century ago. There is a growing need for a new kind of university that would aggressively approach city problems, such as an urban-grant university. This institution would become directly involved in improving the total urban environment -- architecture, use of space, health, poverty, cultural, educational equality and recreational programs -- and thus bridge the gap between campus and community. It would offer city-oriented curricula and research studies, and set up experiment stations to attack municipal problems. Public high school students would benefit from counseling, cooperation between their teachers and university faculty to improve the system's curricula, and other aid that would ensure a smooth transition from high school to college. For heterogeneity, the urban-grant university would aim to attract eligible students within and beyond the surrounding community. Faculty and trustees should be selected on a non-political basis, for their concern with the problems and readiness to seek more effective solutions. The federal government could help to provide land and funds for urban-grant universities or for expansion of existing campuses. Federal grants for programs directly related to city problems would be awarded on the basis of merit and initiative to public and private institutions that apply for support. (WM)

THE
CITY COLLEGE
PAPERS

NUMBER 8

A PHI BETA KAPPA - GAMMA CHAPTER CENTENNIAL LECTURE

ED025198

The Urban-Grant University

A MODEL FOR THE FUTURE

Clark Kerr

HE 000 183

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED025198

THE
CITY COLLEGE
PAPERS

NUMBER 8

A PHI BETA KAPPA - GAMMA CHAPTER CENTENNIAL LECTURE

The Urban-Grant University

A MODEL FOR THE FUTURE

Clark Kerr

THE CITY COLLEGE
NEW YORK
1968

The lecture appearing here was delivered on October 18, 1967 at a Centennial Meeting of The City College (Gamma) Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa. The President of the chapter during the Centennial Year was Fred M. Hechinger, Class of 1943, Education Editor of The New York Times. Gamma Chapter was established at the College in 1867, the third Phi Beta Kappa chapter to be chartered in the State of New York. Throughout its history, Gamma Chapter has played an important role in the affairs of The City College, through critical and constructive observation of campus developments and educational standards. It has sought to reflect in actual practice its stated objective as enunciated in its by-laws, "to foster a zealous devotion to liberal scholarship, free intellectual life inside and outside the College, as well as to promote a regard for the feelings of others which comes from genuine understanding."

Dr. Clark Kerr is one of America's most renowned educators. Presently Director of the Carnegie Study of Higher Education in the United States, he was for nine years, from 1958 to 1967, President of the University of California. Before that, from 1952 to 1958, he served as Chancellor of the Berkeley campus of the University. From 1945 to 1952, Dr. Kerr was Director of the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California (Berkeley). He earned his doctorate in economics from the University of California in 1939. Dr. Kerr has served as arbitrator in labor negotiations for many industries. As an educator he received widespread recognition for his incisive analysis of the development of the "multiversity" trend in modern higher education.

This publication is one of a continuing series of City College Papers published as part of the College's library exchange program.

THE LIBRARY
The City College
The City University of New York
New York, New York 10031

THE URBAN-GRANT UNIVERSITY

May I express to all of you my deep appreciation for the honor which you have given me. I shall cherish it because I have such boundless admiration for City College. It is a very great pleasure to participate in this Centennial Meeting of the City College Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, and especially under the chairmanship of Fred Hechinger, who is one of the best-informed and wisest commentators on all types and levels of education in the United States. In this role, he performs an inestimable service to education, and all of us throughout the nation who are concerned with education greatly appreciate his work.

It has also been wonderful this evening to have a chance to visit with President Buell Gallagher. Here, you look upon him as a New Yorker. I look upon him as a fellow Californian. He taught at the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, ran for Congress in the East Bay district, and, for a time, he and I held the two hottest spots in higher education in California—perhaps in the United States. We suffered together under attacks from the left and the right. But he exhibited his superior wisdom by leaving the California scene to return to this trouble-free and quiescent sanctuary known as City College. I told him this evening that I regretted his leaving California for several reasons: his friendship, the great leadership he would have given the state colleges, and also because his departure left only one lightning rod remaining, and there was a lot of lightning.

For a good many years I have watched City College from afar. I've known many of your graduates as graduate students at the University of California, and many also as faculty members. I sometimes thought that if the City College alumni were to leave the University of California, certain departments would disappear entirely. I am, of course, quite conscious of the fact that one out of every 25 Ph.D.'s in the United States is a graduate of City College or one of her sister institutions in the City University. I know that City College shares with the Berkeley campus of the University of California and the University of Illinois the distinction of being the leading source of undergraduates who go on to receive doctoral degrees. I am also aware that

City College has stood with the University of Chicago and the Berkeley campus as one of the three historic centers of political activism by students. It is interesting to speculate on what these three campuses have in common, why for so many years they have been centers for so much activity. To begin with, of course, each one is a key institution in a key metropolitan area of the nation. Each is relatively large and, beyond that, of high quality. So one may speak of City College as the Berkeley of the East or Berkeley as the City College of the West. All three have had their share of student unrest, and none has found any final solution to these problems. All of us, however, have discovered some things that won't work, and, if I may make a reference to an incident at City College during the thirties—for those of you of that vintage—we have learned that the problems of students cannot be handled by poking an umbrella at them.

I have also known City College as a very stern competitor for faculty talent, as the College became more famous and as you raised your salaries to higher and higher levels, making them increasingly competitive with the University of California. And, of course, City College is the first and most famous of the municipally-supported tuition-free colleges in the United States.

A Centennial meeting is a time to look back and also to look ahead, and I should like to make a few comments in both directions. A hundred years ago, in 1867, City College was emerging from the Civil War years. It had just changed its name from the Free Academy. It was a fairly traditional liberal arts college, with clubs and fraternities and sports being extremely important in college life. But there were two events taking place which helped set some of the distinctive characteristics of City College for the ensuing century. A hundred years ago, there was established here a Phi Beta Kappa chapter, the second in New York and the sixteenth in the nation. And there was also established the first freely-elected student government in the United States. These two events cast their shadow across the future, as City College raised the intellectual stature of students and faculty, and also became a center for student participation in all sorts of activities. Over this hundred years, City College has grown with the city and changed with the city. It will continue to grow, and I am sure it will continue to change.

Now I should like to turn to the future, and I have chosen to talk

this evening about the "urban-grant university"—a new university model, its new assignments and the intensified controversies which may surround it.

The land-grant university movement, as you know, is a little more than a hundred years old. A key purpose of the land-grant movement was to help agriculture throughout the United States. Today these land-grant institutions have risen to great heights of service to much of society. They presently number 67 out of some 2,300 colleges and universities in the nation, but they turn out one-third of all the Ph.D. degrees. In some fields the rate is much higher: 100 per cent in agriculture, for example, and 50 per cent in the biological sciences, 50 per cent in engineering, and 50 per cent in the health professions. Showing their heritage to this very day, they turn out a far smaller proportion of advanced degrees in areas like philosophy and law, foreign languages and the other humanities.

The land-grant idea was one of the great ideas in the history of the United States and of higher education throughout the world. These institutions have contributed enormously to American agriculture and technology, making both the most productive in the world. And they have made great contributions to their particular regions as well as to the nation. How did they accomplish this? They did it, to a large extent, by turning their backs on the then-established model of a college. To the traditional classical curriculum, they added research on the problems of agriculture, and then extension directly to the farm, to help the individual farmer. But beyond the research and beyond the extension work, there was in many of these land-grant institutions a spirit—a spirit of concern, of responsibility and of service—which was really quite remarkable.

Tonight I should like to suggest that we need a new model to add to our existing models for universities in the United States. I have called this new model the "urban-grant university". I have specifically not spoken of the "urban university". The term "urban university" is used in some very strange ways. It is used for universities that receive some financial support from the city. It is also used for any university located in an urban setting, however uncomfortable that institution may be in its setting, however much it may wish it were located someplace else, and however much its concern with the urban community may be limited to combatting the urban blight in its immediate neigh-

borhood. Many institutions around the country called urban universities have turned their backs on their own cities.

I use the term "urban-grant", instead, to indicate a type of university which would have an aggressive approach to the problems of the city, where the city itself and its problems would become the animating focus, as agriculture once was and to some extent still is of the land-grant university. Specifically, I should like to propose that we create, to stand beside the 67 land-grant universities, some 67 urban-grant universities, at least one for each city of over a quarter of a million and several for the very large cities. Not all of these would have to be new institutions, although I hope some would be new. Some institutions could be reoriented; some institutions could have their involvement with urban affairs intensified. A great many new colleges and universities are going to be created in the United States by the end of this century. President Johnson has suggested that, over the next decade, a hundred new colleges and universities may be started each year. My own guess is that there may be more nearly fifty. My proposal is that some of these new institutions each year be of the urban-grant type, to be fully useful to the modern society.

I use the term "urban-grant" to imply something beyond location and orientation, namely, that the federal government should aid the urban-grant university as it has the land-grant university. The federal government might help make the land available as part of urban renewal. Perhaps as new urban transportation systems are developed with federal support, some urban-grant universities could be located at the great central stations of such systems, rising above them and thus easily accessible to all the people in the surrounding community. Or the urban-grant university might be part of the new educational park concept. We talk these days of educational parks, serving large areas of a city, to meet problems of *de facto* segregation and to allow other improvements in our grammar schools and high schools. Perhaps at the center of such an educational park should be a university.

Obviously, there are problems of finding the necessary land for central urban locations. But there are usually areas where land can be made available and where the construction of a new campus will serve to raise the level of activity of the whole surrounding neighborhood. In California, for example, I had proposals before our Board of Regents suggesting new University campuses in central San Francisco

and in downtown Los Angeles. Our studies indicated that efficiently-designed high rise buildings can accommodate a large enrollment on perhaps as little as 35 acres.

The suggestion that the federal government should help with the land and with the money to build these new campuses or to change existing campuses is altogether reasonable. When the land-grant movement began, over 50 per cent of the people in the United States lived on the land; today, only 10 per cent do. The reasons for an urban-grant university now are at least as compelling as were those for the land-grant university in 1862. If you look at the history of federal aid to education in the United States, you see that it has been responsive to the great problems of the nation. The land-grant movement, initiated by the federal government, was responsive to agrarian demands and to problems of national economic expansion. Then, during the depression, the federal government through the NYA aided some students who otherwise could not have afforded to attend college. During World War II, in response to the nation's needs for science, the federal government stepped in with support for scientific research —support which has continued to the present time. The government also provided aid to the returning GI's, and thus launched the tremendous recent expansion of the American college and university system. After Sputnik came the National Defense Education Act, and then, as people became more concerned with community health problems, tremendous sums of federal money for the medical schools and for health research.

Today, great national problems have to do with the cities, with equality of opportunity, with the ending of poverty, with the quality of life, and I think that the federal government might logically respond to these problems by again aiding the proper activities of higher education. The urban-grant university might parallel the land-grant institution not only via city-oriented curricula and on-campus research studies but also by setting up experiment stations to work on the problems of the city as they once worked on the problems of the land, and by setting up intensified urban extension services like agricultural extension. As a counterpart to the county agent, I can visualize a school agent, for example—one who through the research at his university is informed about the best new techniques for language teaching and who can take this knowledge directly into the

public schools in his particular city area. It is true that many urban problems are more complex than those of the land, but this very complexity makes the prospect of confronting them more important and more challenging.

There is one point where I would suggest that the urban-grant university specifically depart from the land-grant model. Rather than a system of selection of institutions by the state governments, I would much prefer to see a system of direct institutional applications to and grants from the federal government. These applications could be submitted by public or private institutions, by existing rural or sub-urban colleges willing to launch new urban campuses or new activities relating to urban problems, by existing urban colleges for expansion and reorientation of their programs, or by public agencies or private groups proposing to establish entirely new institutions. In this way the private "prestige" institutions of the country could participate along with leading state universities and other types of colleges. The grants would be awarded on the basis of merit and initiative, rather than merely by automatic geographical distribution among the states. The participation of some prestige institutions, both public and private, I believe to be highly important to the initial success of the urban-grant movement.

American colleges and universities now face some urgent new assignments. One is to draw in those people who aren't with us today—to their loss and to ours as well. Townsend Harris, the father of City College, of the Free Academy, set forth this destiny for City College:

> To open the doors to all. Let the children of the rich and the poor take their seats together and know of no distinction save that of industry, good conduct and intellect.

And this destiny has been fulfilled—up to a point—by City College. From the very beginning, it has extended equality of opportunity through education to new groups of people, particularly the children of immigrants, just as the land-grant institutions extended educational opportunities to the children of farmers and workers.

But access to college is not sufficiently broad today. We have what Gunnar Myrdal calls an "underclass", and we are not drawing out from this underclass the ability that is there. A start has been made, but we must do far more. Without intending to neglect the problems of other groups, let me note that only half as many Negroes go to a

college or university today as is true of the rest of the population, and half of that one-half go to completely segregated Negro colleges and universities. We have an enormous task of opening the doors to all and of bringing in those groups that have not yet been made full members of American society. And I think this is a key responsibility of the urban-grant university.

Whenever a new college or university campus is established—at least we found this to be the case in California—the number of people going on to a college or university from that area is increased, even though not all may attend the new local institution. The mere existence of a campus close by seems to raise the aspirations of the people surrounding it. Moving directly into the areas of deprivation, as the University of Illinois has done with the Chicago Circle campus, hopefully will bring new people into the colleges and universities.

Every effort should be made, of course, to draw in students from outside the immediate community as well, so that the urban-grant university does not become as segregated as its suburban or rural counterparts. The drawing power will depend in part on the general excellence of the institution. Beyond that, however, I believe there are many students today from all walks of life who are eager to participate in new approaches to our social problems and who would find the urban-grant university an attractive and stimulating setting for their college work.

Beyond drawing in new groups and making their talents available more fully to the nation, the urban-grant university will find many city problems that need to be attacked more directly. In recent years there has been much talk but little effective action. In fact, I think I could make a case that some universities and colleges of the nation are less involved in municipal problems today than they were a third of a century ago. The University of Chicago is less involved than it was in the thirties when Paul Douglas and Charles Merriam were active. And this is true of many other places as well. Rather than moving toward the problems of our cities, we've been moving away from them. There is, for example, an Association of Urban Universities which dates back to 1914 and has 100 members, including Harvard. It is only recently, however, that Harvard has paid attention to the blight of sections of Cambridge or to urban problems more generally. Many of these universities have been *in* the urban setting,

but they have not been *of* it.

May I say that I went back and looked over the City College Centennial addresses of 1947. What were they on? Looking to a new century of service, they spoke of the new science, the new international order, liberalizing the liberal arts college, the problems of organized labor and of the business college. There was no mention of the ghetto. There was no mention of equality of opportunity. There was no mention of urban blight. There was no mention of the inadequacies of the school system at the primary and secondary levels. But these are precisely what the concerns of the urban-grant university, I think, should be. It should come in with its shirt sleeves rolled up.

I think it should take some responsibility for the over-all school systems of its city. I recently attended a conference in Williamsburg on "The World Crisis in Education"—it is really the world *crises* in education. There was a very persuasive point made, in a section called "The Democratization of Education", that those systems which were the most democratized, in the sense that access was based most on merit, were in those nations whose universities had a major responsibility for the entire educational system, including the high schools and the elementary schools. Not only the urban-grant universities but universities generally ought to be looking back more to the high schools. There has been improvement in science and mathematics teaching, for example, because of the interest of the universities. But, by and large, the universities have taken what has come to them and have not really tried to give full assistance to the high schools and their very difficult problems. The universities could assist in a number of ways, helping to improve the quality of the curriculum and the text books, helping to identify people of great potential who, because of their home life or their cultural background, have not seriously considered the prospect of higher education. My experience in California was that the high schools were eager for more contact and assistance than the universities generally were willing to give to them. Of course, this has to be a two-way street. The high schools and the grammar schools can say something about the university and what it does, too, because university curricula and requirements have an impact all along the line on the operation of the earlier schools. The urban-grant university could help provide the framework for this interaction with the city's public school system.

I think, also, the urban-grant university should take some responsibility for the health services of the area. I think that the medical school of the future, if it does its job properly, will be more involved with the health of the surrounding community than the land-grant university was ever involved with the farmers of its state. It will be concerned not just with its university hospital, but with the quality of other hospitals and the development of health centers.

The urban-grant university should be concerned with the urban environment in its totality, its architecture, its space use, its cultural programs and recreational facilities.

Let me add emphatically, however, that the city should not be the sole concern of the urban-grant university. Certainly that should be a central emphasis, but the urban-grant university should from the first plan to follow the land-grant model in its concerns for all the mainstreams of intellectual thought and discovery.

There are a few existing colleges and universities in the United States today that approach in some respects the urban-grant institution I have sketched, but I know of none which could be held up as a full model. The land-grant university turned away from the model of the classical university and eventually had a profound impact on that type of university, so that the Harvard of today is more a land-grant institution—without the land—than the classical university it once was. And so, I believe, the urban-grant university can enter the American scene as a new model, eventually affecting all the others. And some universities will rise to heights of distinction on the urban-grant model, as have many on the land-grant approach.

This new type of university will inevitably find itself embroiled in controversy. There will be a controversy within it over the question of quality. A former president of the University of Minnesota once said that the state universities hold that there is no intellectual service too undignified for them to perform. I disagree with that. But I also disagree with the idea that because something is a city problem, it is not worthy of high-quality attention. I have seen faculty members who would work on an international problem, or on a national problem, or on the problems of local government in some other country, but not on the problems of their own city, because they regarded such work as somehow beneath them. Granted, it can be done at a low-quality level, as can work on national and international problems.

But that is not necessary. We should recognize that local city problems today need and justify work of the very highest quality.

Nor should the student body be expected to be of lower quality, even though it might be desirable to adjust admission standards somewhat to help make the urban-grant university more accessible to minority group students whose earlier educational experience may not have been completely adequate. I have a sense that faculty members across the country increasingly want to make a contribution to the problems of these students, and they feel that they can. They certainly do not intend to lower the quality of the final product that comes out of the college. Rather, by greater attention and greater concern, they intend to help make up for the deficiencies of the earlier years.

These new endeavors will also see some battles among those who want to remain secluded and aloof from immediate problems, as against those who want to work toward the solution of those problems, and as against those who believe the problems can be solved only by changing the entire system. The land-grant institutions did not face so great an internal dispute about their role. Given the nature and intensity of the problems of the cities and the nation today, however, I can easily see disagreements involving students and faculty members over whether it is better to ignore the problems or to work with them or to work against the entire system. To handle the controversy on the campus among these points of view, there will have to be some rules on how opposition is mounted, and I think this is basically the responsibility of the faculty. Surely, we want free speech. Surely, we want criticism. But it must be within the law and it must be in a form that does not interfere with the proper functions of the campus.

Beyond the internal conflicts, this kind of university will be bound to face a great deal of external conflict about what it is doing. There will be those, for example, who will view with apprehension the potential political alliance of the students and the ghetto dwellers. Others will fear the potential involvement of the university in partisan urban politics. The already existing urban institutions, which are for the most part not doing the job of the urban-grant university as I visualize it, will nevertheless view any new institution or new activity as a competitor.

The land-grant institution encountered some external opposition, but not really very much. There were occasional disputes over findings about the relative merits of oleomargarine and butter. I recall a case I had in California, where one of our professors made a study which got headlines, concluding that whiskey not only tasted better than milk but was better for you, and that the older you got, the better it was, until at a certain age milk was an absolute evil and whiskey an immense benefit. I heard a good deal about these findings from the dairy interests and the allied agricultural interests. And there are always some problems from the external community when a faculty member says, for example, that farm wages ought to be higher. But the early land-grant institution faced essentially in one direction, toward the farmers, and served them, and naturally found little criticism there—except that there be more service and that it be more practical.

The urban-grant university, dealing with the problems of the city, will have to face in many directions, not one. When you deal with urban problems, you deal with urban controversies and with urban politics. And so, for this university to work effectively, there will have to be a considerable amount of public understanding—especially understanding of the distinction between service based on applications of knowledge and positions taken because of partisan politics. Beyond that, the institution will need an excellent system of buffers, and this is particularly a challenge to the trustees. I think that they should be selected on a non-political basis and carefully screened, and that they should appreciate that their job is to protect the institution rather than to intensify the pressures from the external community.

There are strong indications today of a widening gulf between our universities, whatever their setting and orientation, and the general public. Some view the universities as elitist institutions apart from the everyday problems of the community. Many resent the criticisms of society that originate on university campuses. Others see the universities as sources of new ideas that are changing people's lives in ways they fear or don't understand or approve. What we need is more contact, not less, between the people and the universities. We must bridge the gulf between the intellectual community and the surrounding society because, if that gulf is permitted to widen, the intellectual community cannot get the resources and support to make it

effective and the people cannot be served by intellect. The urban-grant university can provide such a bridge and, if the greater participation will result in greater controversy, we must be prepared to accept it and deal with it.

And so I would like to urge that we consider the urban-grant university as a positive approach to some of the greatest of our national problems. During World War II we turned to our universities for a vital contribution to national survival. Cannot the intellectual resources that created the new age of science now tackle the equally explosive problem of our cities? The threat is as real and the obligation surely as great.

The university can come increasingly to aid the renovation of our cities, and in return the university can be inspired by the opportunities and strengthened by the participation. If we make this new step forward, if we aggressively accept the challenge of the problems of the great city, if we desire to participate intimately in their solution and to make knowledge serve to the full extent it can, then and only then will higher education in the United States have risen to the challenge of the times.